



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/049,449	08/15/2002	Alexander James Brown	010100-109	3885

128 7590 02/04/2010
HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.
PATENT SERVICES
101 COLUMBIA ROAD
P O BOX 2245
MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245

EXAMINER

GILES, NICHOLAS G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/04/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/049,449	Applicant(s) BROWN ET AL.	
	Examiner NICHOLAS G. GILES	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 January 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 111-114, 116-127, 129 and 131-138 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 121-126 and 135-138 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 111-114, 116-120, 127, 129 and 131-134 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 July 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01/11/2010 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 111 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 111 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 111 lines 8-9 recite " from an associate one or more cameras,". This should be "from an associateded one or more cameras,". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2622

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims **111-114, 116-120, 127, 129, 131, and 133** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enright et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,813) in view of Fernandez et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,697,103) in further view of Igarashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,469,737).

Regarding claim **111**, Enright et al. discloses:

A digital video management system for remove live video monitoring of one or more areas or processes of interest, the system including: a plurality of cameras (cameras 186, 188, 190 Fig. 11), each camera having a respective camera streamer (hardware interface 170 Fig 10) configured to packetize the camera output and to provide live first video signals to a computer communications network (13:62-14:22 and 14:49-15:20, Fig. 3, 28:8-21, 28:51-67, and 29:11-18, note the images can be provides virtually simultaneously to the remote user); a plurality of video servers (mini server 192, 194, 196) configured for linking to the network, wherein each video server is configured to receive the first video signals from an associated one or more cameras (cameras 186, 188, 190, Fig. 11, and 29:38-44), and configured to be responsive to a predetermined schedule for storing on a storage media associated with the server at least some of the first video signals from the associated one or more cameras; at least one client computer terminal configured for linking to the network, the client computer terminal being configured for

requesting, receiving, and displaying to an operator video signals received over the computer communications network, including playback of stored video signals for allowing the operator to review past events, and live video signals for allowing the operator to view events live (28:51-67, 29:20-44, and 48:54-49:8); wherein, in response to a request from the client computer terminal for a live video signal from a selected camera, the video server associated with the selected camera is configured for providing the requested live video signals to the computer communications network wherein the live video signals are addressed to the client computer terminal which issued the request, wherein providing the requested live video signals includes receiving video frames from the camera streamer and re-broadcasting those video frames independent of those frames being stored on storage media (28:51-67, 29:20-44, 48:54-49:8, in 28:51-57 Enright discloses the recovering of image data from memory [previous recorded image data]. Enright then goes on to disclose in immediately adjacent 28:57-61 that "Further the capability of the exemplary embodiment of the invention to capture image and transaction data while virtually simultaneously delivering image and transaction data to a remote user, facilitates maintaining an ATM 146 in operation. Enright shows the storage of the image and transaction data in 29:7-30. 28:51-61 of Enright read in sequence along with 29:7-30 means that captured and stored image and transaction data can be read from memory

and further there is the capability to also virtually simultaneously view live image and transaction data).

Enright is silent with regards to multicast streaming of live video signals and providing the stored video signals such that multiple clients can view and control the same piece of stored video simultaneously without affecting each other. Fernandez et al. discloses this in 4:23-28, 5:4-13, and 11:26-35 where live or prerecorded video is viewed or downloaded in multi-cast mode for viewing or running on an authorized sites or processors. Further in 5:21-35 and 6:40-49 it can be seen that a controller and conduct control of analysis of the obtained video. As can be seen in 5:4-13 of Fernandez this is advantageous in that a group of users of common interest can view the same video. For this reason it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have Enright include multicast streaming of the live video signals and providing the stored video signals such that multiple clients can view and control the same piece of stored video simultaneously without affecting each other.

Enright and Fernandez are silent with regards only one client being able to control the camera video being viewed. Igarashi et al. discloses this in 21:1-5 and 22:17-26. As can be seen in 22:22-26 of Igarashi this is advantageous in that user priority rights can be used where specific users obtain control rights prior to other users. For this reason it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have Enright include only one client being able to control the camera video being viewed.

Regarding claim **112**, see the rejection of claim 111 and note that Enright et al. further discloses:

The predetermined schedule includes a plurality of time based trigger points and the server stores the first video signals starting at a first predetermined period prior to each point and a second predetermined period after each point (18:30-46 and 21:20-41).

Regarding claim **113**, see the rejection of claim 111 and note that Enright et al. further discloses:

The predetermined schedule includes a plurality of event based trigger points and the server stores the first video signals starting at a first predetermined period prior to each point and a second predetermined period after each point (18:30-46 and 21:20-41).

Regarding claim **114**, see the rejection of claim 113 and note that Enright et al. further discloses:

A sensor for providing a third signal to the network, wherein one of the event based trigger points comprises the third signal falling within a predetermined range (Motion detection 18:30-46).

Regarding claim **116**, see the rejection of claim 112 and note that Enright et al. further discloses:

The first and second predetermined periods are configurable based upon one or more of: on a per camera basis, on a per area basis, on an event type basis (21:20-41 and 35:56-36:16).

Regarding claim **117**, see the rejection of claim 112 and note that Enright et al. further discloses:

The duration of the first and second predetermined periods are configurable (18:30-46).

Regarding claim **118**, see the rejection of claim 111 and note that Enright et al. further discloses:

A plurality of client terminals and a controller for controlling the signals that are provided to respective terminals (37:28-47, 28:51-67, 29:11-30, and 37:13-27).

Regarding claim **119**, see the rejection of claim 118 and note that Enright et al. further discloses:

The terminals provide over the network respective camera control commands to the video server and the video server processes those commands and generates control signals that are sent to the relevant camera via the network (35:15-23).

Regarding claim **120**, see the rejection of claim 118 and note that Enright et al. further discloses:

The processing of the commands by the video server includes a determination of whether or not the terminal sending the respective command has access rights to the relevant camera (37:13-27).

Regarding claim **127**, see the rejection of claim 111 and note that Enright et al. further discloses:

The first video signals are compressed by the cameras (13:62-14:22 and 14:49-15:20 and Fig. 3).

Regarding claim **129**, see the rejection of claim 111 and note that Enright et al. further discloses:

The camera streams compress the respective first video signals (13:62-14:22 and 14:49-15:20 and Fig. 3).

Regarding claim **131**, see the rejection of claim 120 and note that Enright et al. further discloses:

The controller is adapted to receive camera control functionality requests from the terminal and to forward camera control commands to the cameras (28:51-67, 29:11-44, and 35:15-23).

Regarding claim **133**, see the rejection of claim 131 and note that Enright et al. further discloses:

The controller is adapted to grant or deny a control request in dependence upon security level information relating to a user making the request (37:13-27).

6. Claim **132** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enright et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,813) in view of Fernandez et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,697,103) in further view of Igarashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,469,737) in further view of Kuno (U.S. Patent No. 6,567,121).

Regarding claim **132**, see the rejection of claim 131 and note that Enright et al. is silent with regards to denying a control request when a camera is being controlled by another terminal. Kuno et al. discloses this in 5:6-11, 5:36-42, 5:48-51, and 6:61-67 and Fig. 9. An advantage to doing this allows clients to be queued for gaining the right of camera access as Kuno shows in 6:61-67. For this reason it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have Enright's system include denying a control request when a camera is being controlled by another terminal.

7. Claim **134** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enright et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,813) in view of Fernandez et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,697,103) in further view of Igarashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,469,737) in further view of Dangi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,231,492).

Regarding claim **134**, see the rejection of claim 111 and note that Enright et al. is silent with regards to priority of the video stream over the audio stream. Dangi et al. discloses this in 11:36-12:2 and Fig. 30. Dangi et al. discloses that this is advantageous when for example a person stands up (eg movement) and the video data changes tremendously. For this reason it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have Enright's system include priority of the video stream over the audio stream.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NICHOLAS G. GILES whose telephone number is (571)272-2824. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:00am to 3:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on (571) 272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nicholas G Giles/
Examiner, Art Unit 2622